arXiv:1412.3290v2 [cs.CG] 23 May 2015

Numeric certified algorithm for the topology of resultant and discriminant curves

Rémi Imbach, Guillaume Moroz, Marc Pouget

RESEARCH REPORT
N° 8653
Mai 2015
Project-Team VEGAS

ISSN 0249-6399 ISRN INRIA/RR--8653--FR+ENG



Numeric certified algorithm for the topology of resultant and discriminant curves

Rémi Imbach, Guillaume Moroz, Marc Pouget

Project-Team VEGAS

Research Report n° 8653 — Mai 2015 — 24 pages

Abstract: Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a real plane algebraic curve defined by the resultant of two polynomials (resp. by the discriminant of a polynomial). Geometrically such a curve is the projection of the intersection of the surfaces $P(x,y,z) = Q(x,y,z) = 0$ (resp. $P(x,y,z) = \frac{\partial P}{\partial z}(x,y,z) = 0$), and generically its singularities are nodes (resp. nodes and ordinary cusps). State-of-the-art numerical algorithms compute the topology of smooth curves but usually fail to certify the topology of singular ones. The main challenge is to find practical numerical criteria that guarantee the existence and the uniqueness of a singularity inside a given box B, while ensuring that B does not contain any closed loop of $\mathcal{C}$. We solve this problem by first providing a square deflation system, based on subresultants, that can be used to certify numerically whether B contains a unique singularity p or not. Then we introduce a numeric adaptive separation criterion based on interval arithmetic to ensure that the topology of $\mathcal{C}$ in B is homeomorphic to the local topology at p. Our algorithms are implemented and experiments show their efficiency compared to state-of-the-art symbolic or homotopic methods.

Key-words: Topology of algebraic curves, subresultant, numerical algorithm, singularities, interval arithmetic, node and cusp singularities

RESEARCH CENTRE
NANCY – GRAND EST

615 rue du Jardin Botanique
CS20101
54603 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex

Algorithmes numériques certifiés pour la topologie d'une courbe résultante ou discriminante

Résumé : Bien que francophones et très attachés à notre langue maternelle, nous avons pensé et rédigé ce travail en anglais comme la grande majorité de la production scientifique mondiale. Dans ce contexte, il est clair que cette version française de l' "abstract" n'a aucun interêt pour notre communauté, et nous avons peu d'espoir qu'il puisse en être autrement même en dehors de notre communauté. Nous proposons néanmoins quelques pistes en français pour cet improbable lecteur et serions comblés si celui-ci en venait à apprendre l'anglais pour pouvoir lire notre prose. Nous étudions la topologie d'une courbe plane issue de la projection d'une courbe lisse dans l'espace. Génériquement, la projection présente des singularités de type noeud et cusp (dans le cas d'un discriminant seulement). Les algorithmes numériques de l'état de l'art ne calculent la topologie que dans le cas de courbes lisses. L'enjeu est donc de concevoir des critères numériques garantissant l'existence et l'unicité d'une singularité dans une boite donnée, tout en assurant que cette boite ne contienne pas d'autre partie de la courbe non connectée à ce point dans la boite. Nous proposons une déflation basée sur les sous-résultants pour le premier problème ainsi qu'un critère de séparation basée sur de l'arithmétique d'intervalles pour le second problème.

Mots-clés : Topologie de courbes algébriques, sous-résultant, algorithme numérique, arithmétique d'interval, noeuds et cusps

1 Introduction

Given a bivariate polynomial f with rational coefficients, a classical problem is the computation of the topology of the real plane curve $\mathcal{C} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 | f(x, y) = 0\}$. One may ask for the topology in the whole plane or restricted to some bounding box. In both cases, the topology is output as an embedded piecewise-linear graph that has the same topology as the curve $\mathcal{C}$. For a smooth curve, the graph is hence a collection of topological circles or lines; for a singular curve, the graph must report all the singularities: isolated points and self-intersections.

Symbolic methods based on the cylindrical algebraic decomposition can guarantee the topology of any curve. However, the high complexity of these purely algebraic methods prevents them to be applied in practice on difficult instances. On the other hand, purely numerical methods such as curve tracking with interval arithmetic or subdivision are efficient in practice for smooth curves but typically fail to certify the topology of singular curves. A long-standing challenge is to extend numerical methods to compute efficiently the topology of singular curves.

Computing the topology of a singular curve can be done in three steps.

1. Enclose the singularities in isolating boxes.
2. Compute the local topology in each box, that is i) compute the number of real branches connected to the singularity, ii) ensure that it contains no other branches.
3. Compute the graph connecting the boxes.

The third step can be done using existing certified numerical algorithms (e.g. [GG10, vdH11, BL13]), we will thus focus on the first two steps.

Contribution and overview. The specificity of the resultant or the discriminant curves computed from generic surfaces is that their singularities are stable, this is a classical result of singularity theory due to Whitney. The key idea of our work is to show that, in this specific case, the over-determined system defining the curve singularities can be transformed into a regular well-constrained system of a transverse intersection of two curves defined by subresultants. This new formulation can be seen as a specific deflation system that does not contain spurious solutions.

Our contribution focuses on the first two steps of the above mentioned topology algorithm for a curve defined by the resultant of two trivariate polynomials P and Q: $f = Resultant_z(P, Q)$.

In Section 2, the main results are Theorems 1 and 2 that characterize the singularities of the resultant or discriminant curve in terms of subresultants under generic assumptions. A semi-algorithm 1 is proposed to check these generic assumptions, i.e. it terminates iff the assumptions are satisfied (note that this is the best one can hope for a purely numerical method). Based on the characterization of Theorems 1 and 2 , Algorithm 2, using subdivision and interval evaluation, isolates the node and cusp singularities with an adaptive certification.

Sections 3 and 4 address the second step on the above mentioned topology algorithm, that is computing the local topology at singularities. Algorithms 3 and 4 in Section 3 distinguish nodes from cusps and compute the number of branches. Then in Section 4, Algorithm 5 certifies that an isolation box of a singular point does not contain locally other branches than those that pass through the singularity.

In Section 5, experiments are detailed showing that our specialized certified numerical method outperforms state-of-the-art implemented methods for polynomials of degree greater or equal to 5. Moreover, the performance of our method is also improved when we restrict the problem to a box.

Notations. Let f be a bivariate polynomial and $\mathcal{C}$ it associated curve. We denote by $f_{x^i y^j}$ the partial derivative $\frac{\partial^{i+j} f}{(\partial x)^i (\partial y)^j}$. A point $p = (\alpha, \beta)$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ is *singular* for f if $f(p) = f_x(p) = f_y(p) = 0$,

and *regular* otherwise. A *node* is a singular point with $\det(\text{Hessian}(f)) = f_{xy}^2 - f_{x^2} f_{y^2} \neq 0$. An *ordinary cusp* is a singular point such that $\det(\text{Hessian}(f)) = 0$ and for all non trivial direction (u, v), $f(\alpha + ut, \beta + vt)$ vanishes at $t = 0$ with multiplicity at most 3.

We denote by $\square f$ any convergent interval extension of f, that is for any box B, $\{f(x, y) | (x, y) \in B\} \subset \square f(B)$, and for any decreasing sequence of boxes B_i converging to a point p, the sequence $\square f(B_i)$ converges to $f(p)$. By abuse of notation, we often simply denote $\square f(B)$ by $\square f$. The Krawczyk operator of a mapping F defined in Lemma 7 is denoted by K_F.

For two polynomials P and Q in $\mathbb{D}[z]$ with $\mathbb{D}$ a unique factorization domain (in this article $\mathbb{D}$ will be $\mathbb{Q}[x, y]$), recall that the i^{th} subresultant polynomial is of degree at most i (see e.g. [Kah03, §3]), we denote it $S_i(z) = s_{ii} z^i + s_{i,i-1} z^{i-1} + \cdots + s_{i0}$. The resultant is thus $S_0(z) = s_{00}$ in $\mathbb{D}$ and we also denote it more classically as $Res_z(P, Q)$. Finally, $\mathbb{V}(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ denotes the solutions of the system $f_1 = \cdots = f_n = 0$.

Previous and related work. There are many works addressing the topology computation via symbolic methods, see for instance the book chapter [MPS+06] and references therein. Most of them use subresultant theory, but there are also some alternatives using only resultants (e.g. [SW05, ES11]) or Gröbner bases and rational univariate representations [CLP+10]. Some alternative even compute a rational univariate representation numerically if all approximate solutions are known [AHS14]. For the restricted case of computing the topology of non-singular curves, numerical methods are usually faster and can in addition reduce the computation to a user defined bounding box. One can mention interval analysis methods [GG10] or more generally certified homotopy methods [BL13, vdH11]. These methods are based on the fact that the regular solutions of a square system can be certified and approximated with quadratic convergence with the interval Newton-Krawczyk operator [Rum83, Neu90]. Another well-studied numerical approach is via recursive subdivision of the plane. Indeed, the initial idea of the marching cube algorithm [LC87] can be further improved with interval arithmetic to certify the topology of smooth curves [Sny92, PV04, LMP08].

For singular curves, isolating the singular points is already a challenge from a numerical point of view. Indeed, singular points are defined by an over-determined system $f = f_x = f_y = 0$ and are not necessarily regular solutions of this system. A classical approach to handle an over-determined system $\{f_1, \ldots, f_m\}$ is to combine its equations in the form $f_{1x_i} f_1 + \cdots + f_{mx_i} f_m = 0$ for each variable $\{x_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n < m}$, to transform it into a square system [Ded06], but this introduces spurious solutions. Singular solutions can be handled through deflation [GLSY07, OWM83, LVZ06, MM11], roughly speaking, the idea is to compute partially the local structure of a non-regular solution, and use this information to create a new system where this solution is regular. However this system is usually still overdetermined, and it does not vanish on the solutions of the original system that do not have the same local structure. Thus, this cannot be directly used to separate solutions with different multiplicity structures. It is important to mention that the certification of solutions of over-determined systems is theoretically out of reach of numerical methods in the general case. In the polynomial case, non-adaptive lower bounds can be used but they are too pessimistic to be practical, see [HS12, Remark 7] or [BCGY12].

When the curve we consider is a resultant, its singular locus can be related to the first subresultant (see [Jou79, §4.3] and [BM09, §5] for examples). In Section 2, we use this structure to exhibit a square deflation system. Another approach would be to exhibit a square system in higher dimension that defines the set of points for which the polynomials P and Q have two solutions. This approach was considered in [DL13] to compute the topology of the apparent contour of a smooth mapping from $\mathbb{R}^2$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$.

The number of real branches connected to the singularity can be computed with the topological degree of a suitable mapping [Sza88, AMW08, MM11] or with the fiber multiplicity together

with isolation on the box boundary [SW05]. Certifying the topology inside a box requires the detection of loops near a singularity. It is usually solved in the literature by isolating the x-extreme points, which reduces the problem to a univariate polynomial computed with resultants ([SW05, MPS$^+$06] for example).

We are not aware of numerical algorithms that can handle in practice the computation of the topology of singular curves. Still, relying on global non-adaptative separation bounds for algebraic systems, the subdivision approach presented in [BCGY12] can theoretically certify the topology of any singular curve. Due to these worst-case bounds, this algorithm cannot be practical. A numerical algebraic geometric approach is presented in [LBSW07] using irreducible decomposition, generic projection and plane sweep, deflation and homotopy to compute the topology of a singular curve in any codimension. So far this work seems more theoretical than practical and the certification of all the algorithm steps appears as a challenge.

2 Subresultant based deflation

The input of algorithms in this section are two trivariate polynomials P, Q and a box B_0 in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Our goal is to isolate the singularities of the plane curve $f = 0$ defined by the resultant of P and Q with respect to z. In this section, we exhibit a square polynomial system $g = h = 0$ and a polynomial u such that the singularities of f are exactly the solutions of the constrained system $g = h = 0$ and $u \neq 0$. Moreover, the singularities are regular solutions of $g = h = 0$, such that numerical methods can certify whether a box contains or not a singularity. In Section 2.1, the constrained system is constructed using subresultants. In Section 2.2, the regularity of this system is translated in terms of types of singularities. Generic assumptions are required so that these characterizations of the singularities of f hold. Section 2.3 presents a semi-algorithm for checking the assumptions that we now define. Given two trivariate polynomials P, Q in $\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$ and a two-dimensional box B_0, we define the generic assumptions:

(A_1) Above the box B_0 for the x and y-coordinates, the intersection of the surfaces $P(x, y, z) = 0$ and $Q(x, y, z) = 0$ is a smooth space curve denoted $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$, i.e. the tangent vector $\mathbf{t} = \nabla P \times \nabla Q$ is nowhere null on $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ (where ∇P is the gradient vector (P_x, P_y, P_z)).

(A_2) Above any point (α, β) in B_0, there are at most two points of $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ counted with multiplicities, or in other words, the polynomial $\gcd(P(\alpha, \beta, z), Q(\alpha, \beta, z))$ has degree at most two. In addition, there are finitely many (α, β) in B_0 such that this degree is two.

(A_3) The leading coefficients $L_P(x, y)$ and $L_Q(x, y)$ of P and Q seen as polynomials in z have no common solutions in B_0.

(A_4) The singularities of the resultant or discriminant curve are only nodes or ordinary cusps.

Note that these assumptions are satisfied for almost all pairs of polynomials in $\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$.

2.1 Singularities via subresultants

Let f be the resultant polynomial (with respect to the variable z) of two polynomials P and Q in $\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$. We always assume that f is square-free and thus its singularities are isolated. Let $S_{sing} = \mathbb{V}(f, f_x f_y)$ be the set of singular points of f and $S_{sres} = \mathbb{V}(s_{11}, s_{10}) - \mathbb{V}(s_{22})$. We prove in this section that, under our assumptions, these two sets coincide.

Theorem 1 ([Rec13])**.** *Let f be the resultant of the polynomials P and Q in $\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$ with respect to the variable z. Then $S_{sres} \subset S_{sing}$ and if the assumptions (A_1) to (A_3) are satisfied then $S_{sing} \subset S_{sres}$.*

Proof of the inclusion $S_{sres} \subset S_{sing}$. Let $I = \langle f, f_x, f_y \rangle$ and $J = \langle s_{11}, s_{10} \rangle : \langle s_{22} \rangle^\infty$, then $S_{sing} = \mathbb{V}(I)$ and $\mathbb{V}(J) = \overline{\mathbb{V}(s_{11}, s_{10}) - \mathbb{V}(s_{22})} = \overline{S_{sres}} \supset S_{sres}$. It is thus sufficient to prove that $I \subset J$, or in other words that there exists a positive integer m such that $\langle f, f_x, f_y \rangle \cdot \langle s_{22} \rangle^m = \langle s_{22}^m f, s_{22}^m f_x, s_{22}^m f_y \rangle \subset \langle s_{11}, s_{10} \rangle$.

The generic chain rule of subresultant (see for instance [Kah03, Theorem 4.1]) yields $s_{22}^2 f = Res(S_2, S_1)$. On the other hand, $Res(S_2, S_1) = \begin{vmatrix} s_{22} & s_{11} & \\ s_{21} & s_{10} & s_{11} \\ s_{20} & & s_{10} \end{vmatrix} = s_{10}^2 s_{22} + s_{11}^2 s_{20} - s_{10} s_{11} s_{21}$. Hence $s_{22}^2 f \in \langle s_{11}, s_{10} \rangle$.

The previous identity expresses $s_{22}^2 f$ as a quadratic form in s_{11} and s_{10}, differentiating with respect to x (or y) yields a sum with s_{11} or s_{10} as a factor in each term, thus $\partial(s_{22}^2 f)$ is in $\langle s_{11}, s_{10} \rangle$. This implies that $\partial(s_{22}^3 f)$ is also in $\langle s_{11}, s_{10} \rangle$. In addition, $\partial(s_{22}^3 f) = 3 s_{22}^2 f \partial s_{22} + s_{22}^3 \partial f$ hence $s_{22}^3 \partial f = \partial(s_{22}^3 f) - 3 s_{22}^2 f \partial s_{22}$ with both terms in $\langle s_{11}, s_{10} \rangle$, thus $\partial(s_{22}^3 f)$ is in $\langle s_{11}, s_{10} \rangle$. We conclude that $\langle s_{22}^3 f, s_{22}^3 f_x, s_{22}^3 f_y \rangle \subset \langle s_{11}, s_{10} \rangle$, hence $I \subset J$ and $S_{sres} \subset S_{sing}$.

Proof of the inclusion $S_{sing} \subset S_{sres}$. Let (α, β) be a singular point of f, so that $f(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. According to the generic condition (A_2), $\gcd(P(\alpha, \beta, z), Q(\alpha, \beta, z))$ has at most two simple roots or one double root.

For the case of a double root, $\gcd(P(\alpha, \beta, z), Q(\alpha, \beta, z))$ has degree 2 and by the gap structure theorem (more precisely its corollary showing the link between the gcd and the last non-vanishing subresultant, see e.g. [Kah03, Corollary 5.1]) and assumption (A_3): (a) this gcd is the subresultant $S_2(\alpha, \beta)$, hence $s_{22}(\alpha, \beta) \neq 0$, and (b) the subresultants of lower indices are vanishing, in particular $s_{11}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ and $s_{10}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. Hence (α, β) is in S_{sres}.

Otherwise, let γ be a simple root of $\gcd(P(\alpha, \beta, z), Q(\alpha, \beta, z))$, the generic condition (A_1) yields that the tangent vector $\mathbf{t}(p)$ to $\mathcal{C}_{P \cap Q}$ at the point $p = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ is well defined and not vertical. Indeed, the multiplicity of γ in $\gcd(P(\alpha, \beta, z), Q(\alpha, \beta, z))$ is 1, so it is also one in at least one of the polynomials $P(\alpha, \beta, z)$ or $Q(\alpha, \beta, z)$. In other words, $P_z(p) \neq 0$ or $Q_z(p) \neq 0$ which implies that the x and y-coordinates of $\mathbf{t}(p)$ cannot both vanish (otherwise, $\mathbf{t}(p)$ would be the null vector contradicting assumption (A_1)). Without loss of generality we may assume that the x-coordinate of $\mathbf{t}(p)$ is not null: $x_{\mathbf{t}(p)} = P_y(p) Q_z(p) - P_z(p) Q_y(p) \neq 0$.

We now apply [BM09, Theorem 5.1] rephrased in the affine setting to P and Q:

$$f_y = \pm \begin{vmatrix} P_y & P_z \\ Q_y & Q_z \end{vmatrix} s_{11} + uP + vQ$$

with u, v in $\mathbb{Q}[x, y]$. Evaluated at p, P and Q vanish and we obtain: $f_y(\alpha, \beta) = \pm x_{\mathbf{t}(p)} s_{11}(\alpha, \beta)$. Since (α, β) is a singular point of f, $f_y(\alpha, \beta) = 0$, and together with $x_{\mathbf{t}(p)} \neq 0$ this gives $s_{11}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. The gap structure theorem and $f(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ then implies that (a) $s_{10}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$, and (b) the degree of $\gcd(P(\alpha, \beta, z), Q(\alpha, \beta, z))$ is at least two. Together with the generic condition (A_2), this degree is exactly two and so is the degree of the second subresultant S_2 evaluated at (α, β), thus $s_{22}(\alpha, \beta) \neq 0$. We then conclude that in this case too (α, β) is in S_{sres}.

2.2 Regularity conditions

The main theorem of this section is the relation between the types of singularities of f and the regularity of the solutions of the system $s_{11} = s_{10} = 0$. We assume for this section that the assumptions (A_1), (A_2) and (A_3) hold.

Theorem 2. *Let f be the resultant of the polynomials P and Q in $Q[x, y, z]$ with respect to the variable z. If the assumptions (A_1), (A_2) and (A_3) hold then the following propositions are equivalent:*

i. p is a regular solution of $s_{11} = s_{10} = 0$ and $s_{22}(p) \neq 0$
ii. p is a node or an ordinary cusp of the curve $f = 0$

Furthermore in this case, p is an ordinary cusp point if and only if $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ has a vertical tangent above p.

The proof of this theorem is decomposed with the following lemmas.

Lemma 3 ([Rec13])**.** *Let p be a node of f. Then p is a regular point of the system $s_{11} = s_{10} = 0$.*

Proof. Since p is a node, it is a singular point of $f = 0$ and Theorem 1 implies that p is a solution of the system $s_{11} = s_{10} = 0$. Moreover, we saw in the proof of Theorem 1 that $S_{sres} \subset S_{sing}$ but more precisely that $\langle s_{22}^3 f, s_{22}^3 f_x, s_{22}^3 f_y\rangle \subset \langle s_{11}, s_{10}\rangle$. In particular, this implies that the multiplicity of p in $\langle s_{11}, s_{10}\rangle$ is lower or equal to its multiplicity in $\langle s_{22}^3 f, s_{22}^3 f_x, s_{22}^3 f_y\rangle$. Since p is a node of f, the determinant of the Hessian of f is non-zero and p is a regular point of $\langle f, f_x, f_y\rangle$. And since $s_{22}(p) \neq 0$, we can conclude that the multiplicity of p in $\langle s_{22}^3 f, s_{22}^3 f_x, s_{22}^3 f_y\rangle$ is 1. Thus p has also a multiplicity one in $\langle s_{11}, s_{10}\rangle$. □

Lemma 4. *Let p be an ordinary cusp point of f. Then p is a regular point of the system $s_{11} = s_{10} = 0$.*

Proof. Let $p = (\alpha, \beta)$ be an ordinary cusp point of f. Suppose by contradiction that p is a singular solution of $s_{11} = s_{10} = 0$. Then the determinant of the Jacobian matrix $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} s_{11x} & s_{10x} \\ s_{11y} & s_{10y}\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is 0 and there exists a vector $(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ orthogonal simultaneously to the gradient of s_{11} and to the gradient of s_{10}. In particular, $s_{11}(\alpha+ut, \beta+vt)$ (resp. $s_{10}(\alpha+ut, \beta+vt)$) vanishes at 0 in t with multiplicity at least 2. Using standard formula on the resultants ([Kah03, Theorem 4.1] for example) we have $s_{22}^2 f = Res(S_1, S_2)$. Developing the right hand side we get:

$$s_{22}^2 f = s_{22}s_{10}^2 - s_{21}s_{11}s_{10} + s_{20}s_{11}^2.$$

Thus, evaluating the right hand side on $(\alpha + ut, \beta + vt)$, we observe that it vanishes at 0 in t with multiplicity at least 4.

On the other hand, p being an ordinary cusp of f, the polynomial $f(\alpha + ut, \beta + vt)$ vanishes at 0 in t with multiplicity at most 3. In addition, under the assumptions (A_2) and (A_3), we have $s_{22}(p) \neq 0$ and the left hand side vanishes at 0 in t with multiplicity at most 3, hence the contradiction. □

Lemma 5. *Let $q = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ be a regular point of the curve $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ such that $s_{22}(p) \neq 0$ with $p = (\alpha, \beta)$. Then q is a regular point of the curve $S_2(x, y, z) = S_1(x, y, z) = 0$. Moreover, the vectors $\nabla P(q), \nabla Q(q)$ generate the same vector space as $\nabla S_2(q)$ and $\nabla S_1(q)$.*

Proof. Using the identities of [Kah03, Theorem 4.2], there exists U, V, U', V' such that:

$$s_{22}^2 P = US_2 + VS_1$$
$$s_{22}^2 Q = U'S_2 + V'S_1$$

Since $s_{22}(p) \neq 0$, we have:

$$\nabla P(q) = \frac{U(q)}{s_{22}(p)^2}\nabla S_2(q) + \frac{V(q)}{s_{22}(p)^2}\nabla S_1(q) \qquad \nabla Q(q) = \frac{U'(q)}{s_{22}(p)^2}\nabla S_2(q) + \frac{V'(q)}{s_{22}(p)^2}\nabla S_1(q)$$

Since q is a regular point of $P = Q = 0$, $\nabla P(q)$ and $\nabla Q(q)$ generate a dimension 2 vector space. Thus $\nabla S_2(q)$ and $\nabla S_1(q)$ also generate the same dimension 2 vector space and q is a regular point of the curve $S_2 = S_1 = 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 2. The implication ii. $\implies$ i. is a direct corollary of Lemma 3 and 4.

For the reciprocal, we know that $s_{22}(p) \neq 0$, thus

$$f = \frac{1}{s_{22}} s_{10}^2 + \frac{1}{s_{22}^2} s_{20} s_{11}^2 - \frac{1}{s_{22}^2} s_{21} s_{10} s_{11}$$

Let us denote by A, J and V the matrices and the vector

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 2s_{22} & -s_{21} \\ -s_{21} & 2s_{20} \end{pmatrix} \qquad J = \begin{pmatrix} s_{10_x} & s_{10_y} \\ s_{11_x} & s_{10_y} \end{pmatrix} \qquad V = \begin{pmatrix} s_{10} \\ s_{11} \end{pmatrix}$$

The resultant satisfies $f = \frac{1}{2s_{22}^2} V^t \cdot A \cdot V$. Let p be a singular point of the curve $f = 0$. According to Theorem 1, $s_{11}(p) = s_{10}(p) = 0$. Moreover, without restriction of generality, we can assume that $(\alpha, \beta, 0)$ satisfy $P(\alpha, \beta, 0) = Q(\alpha, \beta, 0) = 0$ using the property that the resultant is invariant by translation of z in P and Q. In this case, we have also $s_{20}(p) = 0$.

With abuse of notations, we denote by $O_k(x, y)$ a polynomial that is in the ideal $\langle x, y \rangle^k$ where k is a positive integer. In particular we have:

$$\begin{aligned} O_{k_1}(x,y) \cdot O_{k_2}(x,y) &= O_{k_1+k_2}(x,y) \\ O_{k_1}(x,y) + O_{k_2}(x,y) &= O_{min(k_1,k_2)}(x,y) \\ \delta O_k(x,y) &= O_{k-1}(x,y) \text{ for } \delta = \partial/\partial_x \text{ or } \partial/\partial_y \end{aligned}$$

With this notation, the taylor expansion of V at p gives

$$V(p + (x, y)) = J(p) \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + O_2(x, y)$$

such that :

$$f(p + (x, y)) = \frac{1}{2s_{22}(p)^2} \begin{pmatrix} x & y \end{pmatrix} J(p)^t \cdot A(p) \cdot J(p) \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + O_3(x, y)$$

This implies that the Hessian of f at p is the matrix $\frac{1}{s_{22}(p)} J(p)^t \cdot A(p) \cdot J(p)$. If the determinant of the Hessian is not zero, then p is a node. Otherwise we have $\det(A(p)) \det(J(p))^2 = 0$. Let us prove in this case that p is an ordinary cusp in f. For that, we need to prove that for every direction $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, the valuation of t in $f(ut, vt)$ is lower or equal to 3. By hypothesis *i.*, $\det(J) \neq 0$, thus $\det(A(p)) = 4s_{22}(p)s_{20}(p) - s_{21}(p)^2 = 0$. In particular, this means that $s_{21}(p) = 0$. In particular recalling that:

$$f = \frac{1}{s_{22}} s_{10}^2 + \frac{1}{s_{22}^2} s_{20} s_{11}^2 - \frac{1}{s_{22}^2} s_{21} s_{10} s_{11}$$

we have for (u, v) such that $a := u s_{10_x}(p) + v s_{10_y}(p) \neq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{10}^2(\alpha + ut, \beta + vt) &= a^2 t^2 + O_3(t) \\ s_{20} s_{11}^2(\alpha + ut, \beta + vt) &= O_3(t) \\ s_{21} s_{10} s_{11}(\alpha + ut, \beta + vt) &= O_3(t) \end{aligned}$$

This implies:

$$f(\alpha + ut, \beta + vt) = \frac{1}{s_{22}(p)^2} a^2 t^2 + O_3(t)$$

and for (u, v) such that $us_{10x}(p) + vs_{10y}(p) = 0$ there exists a constant $c \neq 0$ such that $(u, v) = (cs_{10y}, -cs_{10x})$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha + ut, \beta + vt) &= \frac{c^3}{s_{22}(p)^2}(s_{20x}(p)s_{10y}(p) - s_{20y}(p)s_{10x}(p))(s_{11x}(p)s_{10y}(p) - s_{11y}(p)s_{10x}(p))^2 t^3 \\ &\quad + O_4(t) \\ &= \frac{c^3}{s_{22}(p)^2} \det(G(p)) \det(J(p))^2 t^3 + O_4(t) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$G := \begin{pmatrix} s_{20x} & s_{20y} \\ s_{10x} & s_{10y} \end{pmatrix}$$

Lemma 5 implies that $(\alpha, \beta, 0)$ is a regular point of $S_2(x, y, z) = S_1(x, y, z) = 0$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla S_1(\alpha, \beta, 0) &= \begin{pmatrix} s_{10x}(p) & s_{10y}(p) & s_{11}(p) \end{pmatrix} \\ \nabla S_2(\alpha, \beta, 0) &= \begin{pmatrix} s_{20x}(p) & s_{20y}(p) & s_{21}(p) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Since $s_{11}(p) = s_{21}(p) = 0$, the point $(\alpha, \beta, 0)$ is regular in $S_2(x, y, z) = S_1(x, y, z) = 0$ only if the determinant of the matrix $G(p)$ is different from zero. In addition, hypothesis $i.$ implies $\det(J(p)) \neq 0$. We thus conclude that for every $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, the valuation of t in $f(ut, vt)$ is lower or equal to 3, and p is an ordinary cusp.

Finally, we prove that p is an ordinary cusp if and only if $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ has a vertical tangent above p at $q = (\alpha, \beta, 0)$. First, if p is an ordinary cusp, then the Hessian of f is zero at p and $\det(A(p)) = 0$. In this case we saw that $s_{21}(p) = 0$ and since $s_{11}(p) = 0$, this implies that $\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial z}(q) = s_{21}(p) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial S_1}{\partial z}(q) = s_{11}(p) = 0$. Using Lemma 5 this implies that $\frac{\partial P}{\partial z}(q) = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial z}(q) = 0$ such that the tangent vector of $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ at q is vertical. Reciprocally, if the tangent vector of $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ at q is vertical, then $\frac{\partial P}{\partial z}(q) = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial z}(q) = 0$ and Lemma 5 implies that $\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial z}(q) = 0$, thus S_2 has a double root in z and $\det(A(p)) = 0$. Thus the Hessian of f is zero at p and p is an ordinary cusp of f. □

2.3 Checking the assumptions

As opposed to symbolic methods, our numerical approach requires assumptions on the input. To be complete we provide a way to check that the assumptions are fulfilled using only numerical methods.

Lemma 6. *The semi-algorithm 1 terminates iff the assumptions* (A_1), (A_2), (A_3) *and* (A_4) *are satisfied.*

Proof. We first show that if the semi-algorithm terminates then (A_1), (A_2), (A_3) and (A_4) are satisfied. Indeed, for any box of the subdivision, (a) Lines 5 ensures that the leadings of P and Q have no common solutions (A_3); (b) Lines 7, 9 and 15 ensures that f, s_{11} and s_{22} do not vanish simultaneously, hence there is at most two points of the curve $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ above each point of B_0, (A_2) is satisfied; (c) Lines 11 and 17 ensures that the curve $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap Q}$ is smooth (A_1); Line 19 finally ensures the regularity assumption (A_4).

Conversely, it is easy to see that when the assumptions (A_1), (A_2), (A_3) and (A_4) are satisfied Semi-algorithm 1 will terminate due to the convergence of the interval functions to the actual value of the corresponding function when the diameter of a box tends to 0. □

Semi-algorithm 1 Subdivision based checking of assumptions (A_1), (A_2), (A_3) and (A_4)

Input: A box B_0 in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and two polynomials P and Q in $\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$.
Output: The semi-algorithm terminates iff the assumptions (A_1), (A_2), (A_3) and (A_4) are satisfied.

Let f be the resultant and s_{22}, s_{11}, s_{10} be the subresultant coefficients of P and Q wrt z.
$L := \{B_0\}$
repeat
  $B := L.pop$
  if $0 \in \square L_P(B)$ **and** $0 \in \square L_Q(B)$ **then** ▷ Checking (A_3)
    Subdivide B and insert its children in L, **continue**
  else if $0 \notin \square f(B)$ **then** ▷ Checking if P and Q have no common solution (A_2)
    continue
  else if $0 \notin \square s_{11}(B)$ **then** ▷ Checking if P and Q have at most 1 common solution (A_2)
    $I_z := -\square s_{10}(B)/\square s_{11}(B)$
    if $(0,0,0) \in \square \mathbf{t}(B \times I_z)$ **then** ▷ Checking (A_1)
      Subdivide B and insert its children in L, **continue**
    else
      continue
  else if $0 \notin \square s_{22}(B)$ **then** ▷ Checking if P and Q have at most 2 common solutions (A_2)
    $I_z :=$ union of the complex boxes solution of: $\square s_{22}(B)z^2 + \square s_{21}(B)z + \square s_{20}(B) = 0$
    if $(0,0,0) \in \square \mathbf{t}(B \times I_z)$ **then** ▷ Checking (A_1)
      Subdivide B and insert its children in L, **continue**
    else if $0 \in \square Jacobian(s_{11}, s_{10})(B)$ **then** ▷ Checking (A_4)
      Subdivide B and insert its children in L, **continue**
    else
      continue
  else
    Subdivide B and insert its children in L, **continue**
until $L = \emptyset$
return true

2.4 Numerical certified isolation

There is no new result in this section, but for the reader's convenience, we recall a classical numerical method to isolate regular solutions of a square system within a given domain via recursive subdivision and show how it applies in our case. Such a subdivision method is often called branch and bound method [Kea96] and uses the Krawczyk operator or Kantorovich theorem to certify existence and unicity of solutions. We recall the properties of the Krawczyk operator and propose the naive Algorithm 2 for the isolation of the singularities of a resultant using the characterization of these points proved in Theorem 2. Note that even if the assumptions (A_1) to (A_4) are satisfied, this naive algorithm may fail if a singularity lies on (or near) the boundary of a box during the subdivision. Indeed, for this algorithm to be certified, there is a need to use ε-inflation of a box when using the Krawczyk test and cluster neighboring boxes of the subdivision. For simplicity we do not detail this issue and refer for instance to [Sta95, §5.9],[Kea97, SN05].

Let F be a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^2$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$ and denote J_F its Jacobian matrix. The following lemma is a classical tool to certify existence and uniqueness of regular solutions of the system $F = (0, 0)$. For simplicity, we state the following lemma on $\mathbb{R}^2$ but this result holds in any dimension.

Lemma 7. *(Krawczyk [Kra69][Rum83, §7]) Let B be a box in $\mathbb{R}^2$, (x_0, y_0) the center point of B*

Algorithm 2 Subdivision based isolation of singularities

Input: A box B_0 in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and two polynomials P and Q in $\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$ such that the assumptions (A_1), (A_2), (A_3) and (A_4) are satisfied.

Output: A list L_{Sing} of boxes such that each box isolates a singularity of the curve defined by $f = Res_z(P, Q)$, and each singularity in B_0 is in a box of L_{Sing}.

```
Let f be the resultant and s22, s11, s10 be the subresultant coefficients of P and Q wrt z.
L := {B0}
repeat
    B := L.pop
    if 0 ∉ □f(B) or 0 ∉ □s11(B) or 0 ∉ □s10(B) then
        Discard B
    else
        if K(s11,s10)(B) ⊂ int(B) and 0 ∉ □s22(B) then
            Insert B in L_Sing
        else
            Subdivide B and insert its children in L
until L = ∅
return L_Sing
```

and $\Delta B = \begin{pmatrix} B_x - x_0 \\ B_y - y_0 \end{pmatrix}$. *Let* N *be the mapping:*

$$N(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} - J_F(x_0, y_0)^{-1} \cdot F(x, y)$$

and K_F *the Krawczyk operator defined by:*

$$K_F(B) := N(x_0, y_0) + \square J_N(B) \cdot \Delta B.$$

If $K_F(B)$ *is contained in the interior of* B *then* $F = (0, 0)$ *has a unique solution in* B.

Termination of Algorithm 2. We assume that P, Q satisfy the assumptions $(A_1), (A_2), (A_3)$ and (A_4). Since in this case the singularities of f are either nodes or ordinary cusp points, Theorem 2 implies that they are regular solutions of the system $s_{11} = s_{10} = 0$. This implies that Algorithm 2 will always terminate.

3 Number of real branches at singularities

Algorithm 2 isolates singularities in boxes. The next step is to identify the singularity type, node or ordinary cusp, and compute the number of real branches of the curve connected to the singular point.

3.1 Resultant

For a resultant curve, recall that nodes are stable singularities whereas cusps are not, thus a purely numerical method cannot distinguish between node and cusp singularities. In particular, given a box B containing a singularity, let I be a box evaluation of the determinant of the Hessian. If I does not vanish in the considered box, it is a node, but if it contains 0, it can still be a node, but also a cusp. For a node, the local topology is easily deduced from the topological degree of the mapping (f_x, f_y).

Lemma 8. *[AMW08, Theorem 4.15] Let B be a box containing a singularity p of f such that $I := \square\det(H)(B) \neq 0$, then if $I < 0$ then p is connected to 4 real branches, otherwise if $I > 0$, then p is an isolated real point.*

Conversely, if p is a node, then for a small enough box containing p, the determinant of the Hessian does not contain 0 and the number of branches connected to p can be recovered. Thus, when B contains a node singularity of the resultant, Semi-algorithm 3 will always terminate and compute the number of real branches connected to p. Note that in the case when the singularity is an ordinary cusp, Semi-algorithm 3 will not terminate.

Semi-algorithm 3 Number of branches at a resultant singularity

Input: A box B in $\mathbb{R}^2$ output by Algorithm 2 containing a unique singular point p.
Output: The number of branches connected to p.

Let f be the resultant and s_{11}, s_{10} be the subresultant coefficients of P and Q wrt z.
while $0 \in \square\det(\text{Hessian}(f))(B)$ **do**
    $B := B \cap K_{(s_{11},s_{10})}(B)$
if $\square\det(\text{Hessian}(f))(B) > 0$ **then return** 0
else return 4

3.2 Discriminant

In this section we focus on a discriminant curve. Let f be the resultant of P and $Q := P_z$ satisfying the assumptions $(A_1), (A_2), (A_3)$ and (A_4). Note that $Res_z(P, P_z) = LT_z(P)Disc_z(P)$, assumption (A_3) implies that the leading coefficient of P in z is constant, such that the curve defined by f is the same as the one defined by the discriminant of P.

As for the resultant, the singularities of the curve $f = 0$ are either nodes or ordinary cusps. Furthermore, for the discriminant curve, the ordinary cusps are stable and we can identify them numerically. Node singularities can be detected and their local topology computed with the same algorithm as in the previous section for the resultant. We will now focus on the case where the singular point is an ordinary cusp. First we show that above an ordinary cusp, the polynomial P has a triple root in z.

Lemma 9. *Under the assumptions $(A_1), (A_2), (A_3), (A_4)$ the point $p = (\alpha, \beta)$ is an ordinary cusp of the discriminant curve $f = 0$ if and only if $P(\alpha, \beta, z)$ has a triple root in z.*

Proof. Under our assumptions, Theorem 2 states that $p = (\alpha, \beta)$ is an ordinary cusp of the discriminant curve $f = 0$ if and only if the curve $\mathcal{C}_{P\cap P_z}$ has a vertical tangent above p. This is the case if and only if there exists γ such that $P_z(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = P_{zz}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = 0$. Moreover, (A_2) implies that $P_{zzz}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \neq 0$, such that γ is a triple root of $P(\alpha, \beta, z)$. □

It is thus desirable to identify cusps via triple points, the following lemma states the regularity of these points which is a necessary condition to use numerical methods for their isolation.

Lemma 10. *If P has a triple point, and the curve $P = P_z = 0$ is smooth then the point is a regular solution of $P = P_z = P_{zz} = 0$.*

Proof. At the triple point q, the Jacobian of the system $P = P_z = P_{zz} = 0$ is $P_{zzz}(q)\begin{vmatrix} P_x(q) & P_{xz}(q) \\ P_y(q) & P_{yz}(q) \end{vmatrix}$. By assumption, $P_{zzz}(q) \neq 0$. Moreover, since the curve $P = P_z = 0$ is regular, at least one minor of its jacobian matrix is not zero. Since $P_z(q) = 0$ and $P_{zz}(q) = 0$, this means that $\begin{vmatrix} P_x(q) & P_{xz}(q) \\ P_y(q) & P_{yz}(q) \end{vmatrix} \neq 0$. Thus the Jacobian is not zero and q is regular. □

The following more effective version of this Lemma delimits the box containing the triple root.

Lemma 11 (triple points)**.** *Let B be a box containing a unique singular point p of f and assume that $0 \notin \square s_{22}$. The polynomial P has a triple point in z above p if and only if the system $P = P_z = P_{zz} = 0$ has a regular solution in the box $B \times I_z$ where I_z is the interval $\frac{-\square s_{21}}{2\square s_{22}}$.*

Proof. If $P(\alpha, \beta, z)$ has a triple root z_0 for $(\alpha, \beta) \in B$, then it has a multiplicity 2 in $\gcd(P(\alpha, \beta, z), P_z(\alpha, \beta, z))$. In particular z_0 is a double root of the second polynomial subresultant $S_2 = s_{22}z^2 + s_{21}z + s_{20}$, and $z_0 = -\frac{s_{21}(\alpha,\beta)}{2s_{22}(\alpha,\beta)} \subset I_z$. Thus if (α, β) is the projection of a triple point of P, then this point is necessarily in the box $B \times I_z$. Finally if the system $P = P_z = P_{zz} = 0$ has a regular solution in $B \times I_z$, then we can conclude that the $3d$ box contains a triple point of P and that its projection is p. □

An ordinary cusp is connected to exactly 2 real branches. Using Lemma 11, Algorithm 4 classifies the singularities between nodes and ordinary cusps, and compute the number of real branches connected to them. It always terminates since the diameter of the box converges toward 0 such that eventually either $\det(\text{Hessian}(f))(B) \neq 0$ or $K_{(P,P_z,P_{zz})}(B \times I_z) \subset int(B \times I_z)$.

Algorithm 4 Number of branches at a discriminant singularity

Input: A box B in $\mathbb{R}^2$ output by Algorithm 2 containing a unique singular point p.
Output: The number of branches connected to p and its singularity type (node or ordinary cusp).

1: Let f be the resultant and $s_{2,2}, s_{2,1}, s_{11}, s_{10}$ be the subresultant coefficients of P and P_z wrt z.
2: **while** true **do**
3: **if** $\square\det(\text{Hessian}(f))(B) > 0$ **then return** (0, node)
4: **if** $\square\det(\text{Hessian}(f))(B) < 0$ **then return** (4, node)
5: $I_z := -\frac{\square s_{21}(B)}{2\square s_{22}(B)}$
6: **if** $K_{(P,P_z,P_{zz})}(B \times I_z) \subset int(B \times I_z)$ **then return** (2, ordinary cusp)
7: $B := B \cap K_{(s_{11},s_{10})}(B)$

4 Loop detection near singularities

Now that we know the number of branches n_p connected to a singularity p, we need to ensure that the enclosing box B computed so far does not contain any other branches not connected to p. First we can refine B until the number of branches crossing the boundary of B matches n_p. But this is not enough, since B could contain closed loops of f. This case can be discarded by ensuring that B contains a unique solution of the system $f_x = f_y = 0$.

4.1 Resultant

In the case of nodes, p is a regular solution of the system $f_x = f_y = 0$ since the determinant of the Jacobian of this system is the determinant of the Hessian of f and is not zero at p. Thus we can use standard tools from interval analysis to guarantee that p is the only root in B of the system $f_x = f_y = 0$.

Lemma 12 (Node near loops)**.** *Let K_{f_x,f_y} be the Krawczyk operator defined in Lemma 7 with respect to the system $f_x = f_y = 0$, and B be a box containing a node p of f. If $K_{f_x,f_y}(B) \subset int(B)$ then B contains no closed loop of f.*

Proof. Lemma 7 ensures that p is the only solution of $f_x = f_y = 0$ in B. If B contains a closed loop included in $int(B)$, then a connected subset of B has its boundary included in the curve defined by f. Thus it contains a point q where f reaches a local extrema and such that $f(q) \neq 0$. In particular, $f_x(q) = f_y(q) = 0$ and $q \neq p$, hence the contradiction. □

Remark 13. *Alternatively, using tools from the next section, denoting by $\square f$ an evaluation of f on the box B, we let $I := \square f_{xx}\square f_{yy} - \square f_{xy}\square f_{xy}$. Then we claim that if I does not contain 0 then B contains at most 1 solution of the system $f_x = f_y = 0$.*

4.2 Discriminant

For the discriminant, the loops near the nodes can be handled as for the resultant. However, the same approach cannot handle ordinary cusps. The problem is that ordinary cusps are singular solutions of the system $f_x = f_y = 0$. We need the following Lemma to handle ordinary cusps.

Lemma 14 (Ordinary cusp near loops)**.** *Let p be an ordinary cusp point of f in a box B. Let J, K, L, M be the intervals:*

$$J = \square f_{yy}$$

$$K = \square f_{yy}^2\square f_{xxx} - 3\square f_{yy}\square f_{xy}\square f_{xxy} + 3\square f_{xy}^2\square f_{xyy} - \square f_{xy}\square f_{xx}\square f_{yyy}$$

$$L = \square f_{yy}\square f_{xxy} + \square f_{xx}\square f_{yyy} - 2\square f_{xy}\square f_{xyy}$$

$$M = \square f_{yy}\square f_{xy} - \square f_{xy}\square f_{yy}$$

and let J', K', L', M' be the intervals obtained by the same formula with x and y swapped. If $I = J(JK - LM)$ or $I' = J'(J'K' - L'M')$ do not contain 0, then B does not contain any closed loop of the curve defined by f.

Remark 15. *If B is small enough, then either I or I' does not contain zero.*

When a solution of a system S is singular, there are several ways to check that a box B does not contain any other solutions of S. One way is to compute a univariate polynomial r vanishing on the projection of the solutions of S (with resultant or Gröbner bases), and check that the projection of B contains only one solution of the square-free part of r. Another way is to use a multivariate version of the Rouché theorem ([VH94] for example). In our case, this would amount to solve a system of two polynomials of degree lower than 3 and check if these solutions are within a suitable complex box containing B.

The method we propose is easy to implement and can potentially be extended to other kinds of functions than polynomials. The main idea behind the proof of Lemma 14 is to compute a pseudo-resultant of f_x and f_y in the ring localized at p. Then using the fact that the evaluation on a box of the coefficients of the Taylor expansion of a polynomial f is included in the evaluation of the corresponding derivative of f, we can compute the evaluation of the local elimination polynomial on B using only derivatives of the polynomials f_x and f_y.

Before proving Lemma 14, we define the notion of separation polynomial that we will use.

Definition 16. *Let S be a bivariate polynomial system vanishing on $p = (\alpha, \beta)$, and I_S the ideal generated by its polynomials. Let k be an integer and q be a polynomial such that $q(x, y)(x-\alpha)^k \in I_S$ and $q(p) \neq 0$. Then we say that q is a* separation polynomial.

A classical separation polynomial is obtained by computing the resultant of f and g seen as univariate polynomials in y with coefficients in $K[x]$. We get a polynomial $r(x)$ that can be factorized in $q(x)(x-\alpha)^k$ where $q(\alpha) \neq 0$. However we do not restrict q to be a univariate polynomial.

Lemma 17. *Let q be a separation polynomial and B be a box containing a solution $p = (\alpha, \beta)$ of S. If $0 \notin \Box q$, then, the solutions of S in B all have the same x-coordinate. Moreover, if there is a polynomial r in I_S such that $0 \notin \Box r_y$, then S has only one solution in B.*

Proof. Let $(x_0, y_0) \in B$ such that $x_0 \neq \alpha$. If $q(x_0, y_0) \neq 0$, then $q(x_0, y_0)(x_0 - \alpha)^k \neq 0$. Thus there is a polynomial in I_S that does not vanish on (x_0, y_0) and this point is not a solution of S. Moreover, if (α, y_0) is solution of S with $y_0 \neq \beta$, then $r(\alpha, \beta) = r(\alpha, y_0) = 0$ and r_y has a solution in B which contradicts the second part of the lemma. □

Proof of Lemma 14 Consider the system $f_x = f_y = 0$. Any closed loop of f contains a solution of this system. The cusp point p is also solution of this system and if B contains no other solution than p, then B cannot contain a loop. By hypothesis, p is a cusp, hence a singular solution of the system $f_x = f_y = 0$. Thus the determinant of the Hessian vanishes and we have: $f_{xy}(p) = f_{x^2}(p) f_{y^2}(p)$. And since p is an ordinary cusp, we know that either $f_{x^2}(p)$ or $f_{y^2}(p)$ is not zero (otherwise the multiplicity would be 4 or more in one direction). Assume without restriction of generality that $f_{y^2}(p) \neq 0$. And let X, Y be two new variables such that $\binom{x}{y} = M \cdot \binom{X}{Y}$ where:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} f_{yy}(p) & 0 \\ -f_{xy}(p) & 1 \end{pmatrix} \binom{X}{Y}$$

Differentiating f along the new variables, we have:

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_{XX} & f_{XY} \\ f_{XY} & f_{YY} \end{pmatrix} = M^T \begin{pmatrix} f_{xx} & f_{xy} \\ f_{xy} & f_{yy} \end{pmatrix} M$$

In particular, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{XY} &= f_{yy}(p) f_{xy} - f_{xy}(p) f_{yy} \\
f_{YY} &= f_{yy} \\
f_{XX} &= f_{yy}(p)^2 f_{x^2} - 2 f_{y^2}(p) f_{xy}(p) f_{xy} + f_{xy}(p)^2 f_{yy} \\
&= f_{yy}(p)(f_{yy}(p) f_{xx} + f_{xx}(p) f_{yy} - 2 f_{xy}(p) f_{xy}) \\
f_{XXX} &= f_{yy}(p)^3 f_{xxx} - 3 f_{yy}(p)^2 f_{xy}(p) f_{xxy} + 3 f_{yy}(p) f_{xy}(p)^2 f_{xyy} - f_{xy}(p)^3 f_{yyy} \\
&= f_{yy}(p)(f_{yy}(p)^2 f_{xxx} - 3 f_{yy}(p) f_{xy}(p) f_{xxy} + 3 f_{xy}(p)^2 f_{xyy} - f_{xy}(p) f_{xx}(p) f_{yyy})
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $f_{XY}(p) = 0$ and $f_{XX}(p) = f_{yy}(p)(f_{xx}(p) f_{yy}(p) - f_{xy}(p)^2) = 0$. Thus, the polynomial system f_X, f_Y has the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_X &= a(X)\Delta X^2 + b(X, Y)\Delta Y \\
f_Y &= c(X)\Delta X^2 + d(X, Y)\Delta Y
\end{aligned}$$

Eliminating ΔY, we get the polynomial $\Delta X^2(ad - cb)$ in the ideal generated by f_x and f_y. Letting $q = ad - cb$, we can verify that $q(p) \neq 0$. Indeed we have $2q(p) = f_{XXX}(p) f_{YY}(p) - f_{XXY}(p) f_{XY}(p) = f_{XXX}(p) f_{YY}(p)$. By assumption, $f_{YY}(p) = f_{yy}(p) \neq 0$ and since p is an ordinary cusp, it cannot have a triple root in X and $f_{XXX}(p) \neq 0$. Thus q is a separation polynomial.

Then, we can observe that $a(X) = \frac{f_X(X,\beta)}{\Delta X^2}$, $c(X) = \frac{f_Y(X,\beta)}{\Delta X^2}$, and $b(X,Y) = \frac{f_X - a\Delta X^2}{\Delta Y}$, $d(X,Y) = \frac{f_Y - c\Delta X^2}{\Delta Y}$. Thus, using Taylor-Lagrange theorem, we can deduce that if B is a box containing (α,β):

$$a(B) \subset \frac{\square f_{XXX}}{2} \qquad c(B) \subset \frac{\square f_{XXY}}{2}$$
$$b(B) \subset \square f_{XY} \qquad d(B) \subset \square f_{YY}$$

Finally, evaluating $2q$ on a box containing p, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
2\square q &\subset \square f_{XXX}\square f_{YY} - \square f_{XXY}\square f_{XY} \\
&\subset f_{yy}(p)(f_{yy}(p)^2\square f_{xxx} - 3f_{yy}(p)f_{xy}(p)\square f_{xxy} + 3f_{xy}(p)^2\square f_{xyy} - f_{xy}(p)f_{xx}(p)\square f_{yyy})\square f_{yy} \\
&\quad - f_{yy}(p)(f_{yy}(p)\square f_{xxy} + f_{xx}(p)\square f_{yyy} - 2f_{xy}(p)\square f_{xyy})(f_{yy}(p)\square f_{xy} - f_{xy}(p)\square f_{yy}) \\
&\subset I(IJ - KL)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus if $0 \notin I(IJ - KL)$ then, $0 \notin \square q$ and $0 \notin \square f_{YY}$, thus B contains no other solution of $f_x = f_y = 0$ than p.

4.3 Algorithm for the resultant and the discriminant curves

Using the interval criteria of Lemmas 12 and 14 for the detection of loops, Algorithm 5 returns a refined box of a singular point that avoids closed loops of the curve, as soon as we know in advance if the singularity is a node or an ordinary cusp. Note that this algorithm always terminates if the singularity is a node or an ordinary cusp, and works for any algebraic curve.

Algorithm 5 Avoid curve loops in a singularity box

Input: A box B in $\mathbb{R}^2$ output by Algorithm 3 or Algorithm 4 containing a unique singular point p with its type: node or cusp.
Output: A box that avoids closed loops of the curve.

1: Let f be the resultant and $s_{22}, s_{21}, s_{11}, s_{10}$ be the subresultant coefficients of P and P_z wrt z.
2: **while** true **do**
3: **if** B-type = node **and** $K_{(f_x,f_y)}(B) \subset int(B)$ **then return** B
4: **if** B-type = cusp **then**
5: Compute I and I' as defined in Lemma 14
6: **if** $0 \notin I$ **or** $0 \notin I'$ **then return** B
7: $B := B \cap K_{(s_{11},s_{10})}(B)$

5 Experiments

As a proof of concept of the approach presented in this paper to compute the topology of a singular plane curve defined by a resultant or a discriminant, we have implemented steps (1) and (2) proposed in Section 1. Recall that step (1) consists in isolating the singularities of the curve. This isolation is performed by Algorithm 2 and we compare our results with state-of-the-art symbolic and homotopic methods. In step (2), topology around singularities is computed. It is addressed in this paper by Algorithms 3 and 4, that determine the number of branches at a

singularity and its nature (node or cusp), and algorithm 5 that ensures that no loops lie in a box containing a singularity.

All softwares were tested on a Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU L5640 @ 2.27GHz machine with Linux. Running times given here have to be understood as sequential times in seconds.

Section 5.1 gives details on our implementation and the other softwares used for comparison. Section 5.2 presents results of our approach for the isolation of singularities, and a comparison to state-of-the-art symbolic and numeric methods. Section 5.3 reports our results for the computation of the local topology at singularities.

Data for Tables 1, 2 and 3. Random dense polynomials P, Q are generated with given degree d and bitsize σ, that is the coefficients are integers chosen uniformly at random with absolute values smaller than 2^σ. Unless explicitly stated, the given running times are averages over five instances for each pair (d, σ).

5.1 Details of implementations

Symbolic methods. We tested `RS4`, developed by Fabrice Rouillier, that is specialized for bivariate systems and uses triangular decompositions and Rational Univariate Representations(RUR); it is shown in [BLPR11, Bou14] that it is one of the best bivariate solvers. Roughly speaking, it performs two steps: the first one, purely symbolic, computes the RUR of the system. The second one is the numeric isolation of the solutions. A more stable but less efficient version, called `RSCube`[1], can be found as a package for the software `Maple`.

The first column of Tables 1 and 2 reports running times in seconds for `RS4` for isolating the real solutions of the system $\{s_{11}, s_{10}\}$. Recall that solutions of this system are singularities of the curve only if they also are solutions of the resultant res.

We did also test the routine `Isolate` of the package `RootFinding` natively available within `Maple`. Since it deals with over-determined systems, it has been used to isolate solutions of $\{s_{11}, s_{10}, res\}$. Obtained results are not reported in Tables 1 and 2 because they are outperformed by `RS4` in every cases.

Homotopy methods. We tested two homotopy solvers, `HOM4PS` [LLT08] and `Bertini`[2]. These methods do not accept constraints, thus the isolation of the system $\{s_{11}, s_{10}\}$ is performed. Note that the path tracking of these software is not certified and solutions can be missed when the path tracker jumps from one path to another. We measure the reliability of a resolution by comparing the number of obtained complex solutions to the Bézout bound of the system, which is the actual number of solutions since our systems are dense and regular. In Tables 1 and 2, this measure is reported in the column nsol/deg. Notice that we tackled the problem of overflows that can arise when representing large integers by normalizing coefficients of input polynomials.

Subdivision method. We have implemented Algorithms 2, 3, 4 and 5 within the mathematical software `sage`. The critical sub-algorithms are the evaluation of polynomials and the Krawczik operator. Since the subresultant polynomials s_{10} and s_{11} have a large number of monomials with very large coefficients, an important issue lies in both efficiency and sharpness of their interval evaluation. We used the `fast_polynomial` library [Mor13] that allows to compile polynomial evaluations using Horner scheme. The double precision interval arithmetic of the `C++ boost` library is used for Tables 1 and 2. For Table 3, we used the quadruple precision interval arithmetic

[1] available at https://gforge.inria.fr/projects/rsdev/
[2] https://bertini.nd.edu/

of MPFI [RR05]. We used the centered form at order two evaluation of polynomials that requires to compute symbolically partial derivatives up to order two of polynomials. Precisely, for a box B with center c, $\square f(B) = f(c)+J_f(c)(B-c)+\frac{1}{2}H_f(B)(B-c)^2$ where J_f is the Jacobian and H_f the Hessian of f. This evaluation form is studied in [Neu90, §2.4] and proved to be quadratically convergent. It happened to be more efficient in our experiments than the classical mean value form. In the Krawczik operator, derivatives of s_{10} and s_{11} are evaluated at order 1.

Algorithm 2 performs the isolation in a bounded box. To extend the isolation to all real solutions, we use a method introduced by [Neu90, p. 210] (see also [Sta95, §5.10] for a two dimensional example). By changes of variables, this method transforms the isolation problem in $\mathbb{R}^2$ to three isolations in the bounded box $[-1,1]\times[-1,1]$. The running times of Algorithm 2 are given for the input box $[-1,1]\times[-1,1]$ and for the global isolation in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Concerning the isolation in $[-1,1]\times[-1,1]$, the column diam of Tables 1 and 2 gives the minimum value of $\log_{10}(diam(B))$ for all boxes B either discarded or inserted in the list of results L_{sing} in Algorithm 2, and $diam(B)$ stands for the diameter of B.

5.2 Singularities isolation: Tables 1 and 2

We analyze the results obtained with different approaches to isolate singularities of a plane curve defined by $Resultant_z(P,Q) = 0$. Table 1 reports results for a constant bitsize $\sigma = 8$ and a variable degree d while in Table 2 the degree is a constant $d = 4$ and the bitsize σ is the variable.

- For all methods, the running times increases significantly with the degree of the input polynomials.
- Only the symbolic method has a significant increase of running time with the bitsize of the input polynomials.
- `HOM4PS` performs computation in double precision. Notice that it fails to parse input polynomials with large numbers of monomials. For instance, for P, Q of degree 8, the subresultant polynomial s_{10} has 1326 monomials. In addition, as reported by the column nsol/deg, `HOM4PS` fails to find all solutions.

  `Bertini` allows to use adaptive multi-precision and this has two consequences. First, `Bertini` was almost always able to isolate all solutions, thus we did not add the column nsol/deg as for `HOM4PS`. It only failed once in our experiments for a pair of input polynomials of degree 7 with bitsize 8, where the maximum precision of 1024 bits has been reached. Note also that for a degree larger than 7, we only computed a subset of the solutions so we cannot report on this reliability measure. Second, the multi-precision arithmetic has a heavy cost.

  `Bertini` is thus more reliable but also slower than `HOM4PS`.
- The isolation by subdivision in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is roughly three times more expensive than in the bounded box $[-1,1]\times[-1,1]$. This is consistent with the fact that the isolation in $\mathbb{R}^2$ involves three isolations of systems of roughly the same complexity on this bounded box.
- With constant values of (d,σ), running times of the subdivision approach have a high variance. For instance, when $(d,\sigma) = (5,4)$ running times for the isolation in $\mathbb{R}^2$ are, for the five instances, $(229, 4.56, 3.03, 1.67, 2.08)$.
- Our approach is certified and more efficient than both homotopic and symbolic tested methods when $d > 6$ for all the tests we did perform.

5.3 Topology around singularities

We focus here on the computation of the topology around singularities of resultant and discriminant curves by applying successively Algorithms 3 or 4, and 5.

Table 3 reports the results for different degrees d and constant bitsize $\sigma = 8$ input polynomials. Algorithms 3 or 4, and 5 are applied on all boxes containing singularities given by our global subdivision method. Table 3 gives, for each type of curve and each pair (d, σ) the minimum, median and maximum of values $\log_{10}(diam(B))$ where B are the output boxes for which the topology is computed and certified. The large range of sizes for local topology certified boxes is due to the diversity of the local geometry of the curve around a singular point: a singular point may be near to another or near to a branch of the curve not connected to it locally. The sizes are smaller for certifying singularities of a discriminant curve since the test involves higher degrees polynomials to be evaluated.

We finally propose to appreciate the quality of different tests presented in this paper on an example with a cusp and a nearby loop. Consider the polynomial P_{cusp} defined as follows

$$P_{\text{cusp}} = (z^3 + zx - y)((x - \delta')^2 + (z - 1)^2 + y^2) - (\delta'/3)^2$$

Its discriminant curve with respect to z is schematically drawn in the left part of Figure 1. This curve has a cusp point near $(0, 0)$ and a loop at a distance $\delta \simeq \delta'$ of this cusp point. The radius of the loop is approximately δ. While the value of δ' decreases, we compute

- the largest diameter τ_K of a box B centered at the cusp point such that $K_{(s_{11},s_{10})}(B) \subset B$,
- the largest diameter τ_C of a box B centered at the cusp point such that Algorithm 4 detects that the singularity in B is a cusp,
- the largest diameter τ_L of a box B centered at the cusp point such that the test of Lemma 14 is satisfied.

The right part of figure 1 displays the values of $\log_{10}(\frac{\tau_K}{\delta})$, $\log_{10}(\frac{\tau_C}{\delta})$, $\log_{10}(\frac{\tau_L}{\delta})$ when $\log_{10}(\delta)$ varies in $[-0.5, -6]$. For instance, when $\delta' = 2^{-16} \simeq 1.5 * 10^{-5}$, we obtain $\delta \simeq 10^{-5}$, $\tau_L \simeq 3.9 * 10^{-9}$, $\tau_K \simeq 3 * 10^{-11}$ and $\tau_C \simeq 1.7 * 10^{-21}$. In this very precise case, the isolation of the singularities in the initial box $[-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$ together with the computation of the local topology with our certified numerical method takes 2.94 seconds.

Notice that once a singularity has been isolated in a box B by the subdivision process, the box B' allowing to certify the nature of the singularity is obtained by contracting B with the Krawczik operator, which is known to be quadratically convergent. In the above example, when $\delta' = 2^{-16}$, three iterations of the Krawczik operator are needed to obtain the suitable box. As a consequence, rather than having an incidence on the computation time, the high gradient of τ_C with respect to δ leads to the need of a multi-precision arithmetic to carry out the topology certification.

Finally one can remark that in this example the test to avoid loops presented in Lemma 14 do not require to contract the box obtained by the subdivision process to be fulfilled.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Laurent Busé and Éric Schost for fruitful discussions.

Table 1: Isolating singularities of $Resultant_Z(P,Q)=0$, with P and Q of degree d and coefficients of constant bitsize $\sigma=8$. The running times are in seconds, the value diam is the minimum value of $\log_{10}(diam(B))$ for all boxes B considered in Algorithm 2, where $diam(B)$ is the diameter of the box.

	RS4	HOM4PS		Bertini	Subdivision		
domain	$\mathbb{R}^2$	$\mathbb{C}^2$		$\mathbb{C}^2$	$[-1,1]\times[-1,1]$		$\mathbb{R}^2$
d,σ	t	t	nsol/deg	t	t	diam	t
$4,8$	0.214	0.078	98.6%	3.256	0.435	-3.2	1.071
$5,8$	2.845	1.543	96.3%	124.774	0.682	-3.0	2.678
$6,8$	23.90	15.18	90.3%	1604 (2)	3.067	-3.8	9.630
$7,8$	137.9	97.95	75.5%	83120 (2)	8.469	-4.4	27.43
$8,8$	725.7	(1)	(1)	382200 (2,3)	43.47	-5.0	82.98
$9,8$	2720 (2)	(1)	(1)	2766400 (2,3)	47.25	-4.8	273.2

(1) Fails with segmentation false (does not support polynomials with large number of terms)
(2) Has been run on a unique example
(3) Time has been obtained by interpolating the time spent for tracking a unique path

Table 2: Isolating singularities of $Resultant_Z(P,Q)=0$, with P and Q of constant degree $d=5$ and coefficients of bitsize σ. The running times are in seconds, the value diam is the minimum value of $\log_{10}(diam(B))$ for all boxes B considered in Algorithm 2, where $diam(B)$ is the diameter of the box.

	RS4	HOM4PS		Bertini	Subdivision		
domain	$\mathbb{R}^2$	$\mathbb{C}^2$		$\mathbb{C}^2$	$[-1,1]\times[-1,1]$		$\mathbb{R}^2$
d,σ	t	t	nsol/deg	t	t	diam	t
$5,4$	1.788	1.532	94.63%	263.4	0.755	-3.2	48.13
$5,8$	2.845	1.543	96.32%	124.7	0.682	-3.0	2.678
$5,16$	4.687	1.431	93.60%	300.2	7.052	-4.2	19.22
$5,32$	7.468	1.817	94.48%	264.2	2.439	-3.6	7.173
$5,64$	13.33	1.728	96.98%	233.7	1.906	-3.4	4.676

Table 3: Computing topology around singularities of discriminant (resp. resultant) curves when P (resp. P,Q) has degree d and constant bit-size $\sigma=8$. The values min, med and max are the minimum, median and maximum values of $\log_{10}(diam(B))$ where B are the output boxes for which the topology is computed and certified by Algorithms 3 or 4, and 5 and $diam(B)$ is the diameter of the box.

	Resultant			Discriminant		
d,σ	min	med	max	min	med	max
$4,8$	-5	-4	-2	-12	-5	-3
$5,8$	-6	-4	-2	-9	-4	-3
$6,8$	-8	-5	-3	-17	-5	-2
$7,8$	-9	-4	-3	-15	-6	-3
$8,8$	-12	-5	-3	-12	-6	-2
$9,8$	-9	-5	-3	-15	-6	-3

References

[AHS14] Tulay Ayyildiz Akoglu, Jonathan D. Hauenstein, and Ágnes Szántó. Certifying solutions to overdetermined and singular polynomial systems over Q. *CoRR*, abs/1408.2721, 2014.

[AMW08] L. Alberti, B. Mourrain, and J. Wintz. Topology and arrangement computation of semi-algebraic planar curves. *Comput. Aided Geom. Des.*, 25(8):631–651, 2008.

[BCGY12] Michael Burr, Sung Woo Choi, Ben Galehouse, and Chee K. Yap. Complete subdivision algorithms, ii: Isotopic meshing of singular algebraic curves. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 47(2):131 – 152, 2012.

[BL13] Carlos Beltrán and Anton Leykin. Robust certified numerical homotopy tracking. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 1–43, 2013.

[BLPR11] Y. Bouzidi, S. Lazard, M. Pouget, and F. Rouillier. New bivariate system solver and topology of algebraic curves. In *27th European Workshop on Computational Geometry - EuroCG*, 2011.

[BM09] Laurent Busé and Bernard Mourrain. Explicit factors of some iterated resultants and discriminants. *Mathematics of Computation*, 78(265):345–386, 2009.

[Bou14] Yacine Bouzidi. *Solving bivariate algebraic systems and topology of plane curves.* Theses, Université de Lorraine, March 2014.

[CLP+10] J. Cheng, S. Lazard, L. Pe naranda, M. Pouget, F. Rouillier, and E. Tsigaridas. On the topology of real algebraic plane curves. *Mathematics in Computer Science*, 4:113–137, 2010.

[Ded06] J.P. Dedieu. *Points fixes, zéros et la méthode de Newton.* Mathématiques et Applications. Springer, 2006.

[DL13] Nicolas Delanoue and Sébastien Lagrange. A numerical approach to compute the topology of the apparent contour of a smooth mapping from R^2 to R^2. *submitted to Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 2013.

[ES11] Pavel Emeliyanenko and Michael Sagraloff. On the complexity of solving a bivariate polynomial system. *CoRR*, abs/1104.4954, 2011.

[GG10] Alexandre Goldsztejn and Laurent Granvilliers. A new framework for sharp and efficient resolution of ncsp with manifolds of solutions. *Constraints*, 15(2):190–212, April 2010.

[GLSY07] M. Giusti, G. Lecerf, B. Salvy, and J.-C. Yakoubsohn. On location and approximation of clusters of zeros: Case of embedding dimension one. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 7(1):1–58, February 2007.

[HS12] Jonathan D. Hauenstein and Frank Sottile. Algorithm 921: alphacertified: Certifying solutions to polynomial systems. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 38(4):28:1–28:20, August 2012.

[Jou79] J. P. Jouanolou. Singularités rationnelles du résultant. In *Algebraic geometry (Proc. Summer Meeting, Univ. Copenhagen, Copenhagen, 1978)*, volume 732 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 183–213. Springer, Berlin, 1979.

[Kah03] M'hammed El Kahoui. An elementary approach to subresultants theory. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 35(3):281–292, 2003.

[Kea96] R. Baker Kearfott. *Rigorous global search : continuous problems*. Nonconvex optimization and its applications. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, 1996.

[Kea97] R Baker Kearfott. Empirical evaluation of innovations in interval branch and bound algorithms for nonlinear systems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 18(2):574–594, 1997.

[Kra69] R. Krawczyk. Newton-Algorithmen zur Bestimmung von Nullstellen mit Fehlerschranken. *Computing (Arch. Elektron. Rechnen)*, 4:187–201, 1969.

[LBSW07] Ye Lu, Daniel J. Bates, Andrew J. Sommese, and Charles W. Wampler. Finding all real points of a complex curve. In *Algebra, geometry and their interactions*, volume 448 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 183–205. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[LC87] W. E. Lorensen and H. E. Cline. Marching cubes: A high resolution 3d surface construction algorithm. *SIGGRAPH Comput. Graph.*, 21:163–169, August 1987.

[LLT08] T.L. Lee, T.Y. Li, and C.H. Tsai. Hom4ps-2.0: a software package for solving polynomial systems by the polyhedral homotopy continuation method. *Computing*, 83(2-3):109–133, 2008.

[LMP08] C. Liang, B. Mourrain, and J. Pavone. Subdivision methods for 2d and 3d implicit curves. In *Geometric modeling and algebraic geometry*, pages 171–186. Springer, 2008. RR INRIA in 2005.

[LVZ06] Anton Leykin, Jan Verschelde, and Ailing Zhao. Newton's method with deflation for isolated singularities of polynomial systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 359(13):111 – 122, 2006.

[MM11] Angelos Mantzaflaris and Bernard Mourrain. Deflation and certified isolation of singular zeros of polynomial systems. In *Proceedings of the 36th international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation*, ISSAC '11, pages 249–256, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.

[Mor13] Guillaume Moroz. Fast polynomial evaluation and composition. Technical Report RT-0453, Inria Nancy - Grand Est (Villers-lès-Nancy, France), July 2013.

[MPS+06] Bernard Mourrain, Sylvain Pion, Susan Schmitt, Jean-Pierre Técourt, Elias P. Tsigaridas, and Nicola Wolpert. Algebraic issues in Computational Geometry. In J.-D. Boissonnat and M. Teillaud, editors, *Effective Computational Geometry for Curves and Surfaces*, Mathematics and Visualization, chapter 3, pages 117–155. Springer, 2006.

[Neu90] A. Neumaier. *Interval methods for systems of equations / Arnold Neumaier*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge [England] ; New York :, 1990.

[OWM83] Takeo Ojika, Satoshi Watanabe, and Taketomo Mitsui. Deflation algorithm for the multiple roots of a system of nonlinear equations. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 96(2):463 – 479, 1983.

[PV04] S. Plantinga and G. Vegter. Isotopic approximation of implicit curves and surfaces. In *SGP '04: Eurographics/ACM SIGGRAPH Symposium on Geometry Processing*, pages 245–254, 2004.

[Rec13] Judit Recknagel. Topology of planar singular curves resultant of two trivariate polynomials, August 2013. Bachelor's Thesis.

[RR05] N. Revol and F. Rouillier. Motivations for an arbitrary precision interval arithmetic and the mpfi library. *Reliable Computing*, 11:1–16, 2005.

[Rum83] Siegfried M. Rump. Solving algebraic problems with high accuracy. In *Proc. of the symposium on A new approach to scientific computation*, pages 51–120, San Diego, CA, USA, 1983. Academic Press Professional, Inc.

[SN05] Hermann Schichl and Arnold Neumaier. Exclusion regions for systems of equations. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 42(1):pp. 383–408, 2005.

[Sny92] John M. Snyder. Interval analysis for computer graphics. In *Proceedings of the 19th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*, SIGGRAPH '92, pages 121–130, New York, NY, USA, 1992. ACM.

[Sta95] Volker Stahl. *Interval Methods for Bounding the Range of Polynomials and Solving Systems of Nonlinear Equations*. PhD thesis, Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria, 1995.

[SW05] R. Seidel and N. Wolpert. On the exact computation of the topology of real algebraic curves. In *Proc 21st ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 107–115, 2005.

[Sza88] Zbigniew Szafraniec. On the number of branches of a 1-dimensional semianalytic set. *Kodai Math. J.*, 11(1):78–85, 1988.

[vdH11] J. van der Hoeven. Reliable homotopy continuation. Technical report, HAL, 2011. `http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00589948/fr/`.

[VH94] Jan Verschelde and Ann Haegemans. Homotopies for solving polynomial systems within a bounded domain. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 133(1):165–185, October 1994.



Figure 1: Left: a schematic representation of the discriminant of the polynomial P_{cusp}. Right: largest diameters τ_K, τ_C, τ_L of a certified box as a function of the parameter δ.



RESEARCH CENTRE
NANCY – GRAND EST

615 rue du Jardin Botanique
CS20101
54603 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex

Publisher
Inria
Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt
BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex
inria.fr

ISSN 0249-6399